

<https://stevekirsch.substack.com/p/documents-leaked-from-the-ema-confirms>

## Documents leaked from the EMA confirms why we aren't allowed to analyze the vaccine vials



One of my readers has been trying to get my attention for 8 months on the [EMA data leak that happened nearly 2 years ago](#).

He recently posted this [substack article](#) documenting his attempts to get visibility on what the EMA document leak revealed.

The gem in the article is this video which was posted 18 months ago that few people have seen. The [video is just 14 minutes long](#) and is very well done. The findings are all consistent with what I and others have long suspected: **the vials are all different**.

The key finding is **the reason they won't let anyone analyze the vials: mRNA is not intact**. The [BMJ wrote about this](#) on March 10, 2021 [my comments are in brackets]:

1. On Nov 23, 2020, EMA knew about the quality control issues with severely compromised mRNA integrity (ranging from 78% to 55%). [It's supposed to be 100% if you want an effective vaccine.]
2. Just two days later, a source in the US said the lots were now "back at around 70-75%, which leaves us cautiously optimistic that additional data could address the issue."
3. "The **complete, intact mRNA molecule is essential** to its potency as a vaccine," professor of biopharmaceutics Daan J.A. Crommelin and colleagues wrote in a review article in *The Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences* late last year."
4. *The BMJ* asked Pfizer, Moderna, and CureVac, as well as several regulators, what percentage mRNA integrity they consider acceptable for vaccines against covid-19. None offered any specifics. ["Wow, that's really comforting. <sarcasm off>"]
5. The EMA told *The BMJ* that the levels of truncated mRNA "and the amounts of **a potential protein produced by the truncated mRNA** would be too low to constitute a safety risk." [uh... how does the EMA know that exactly?]
6. Health Canada told *The BMJ* that Pfizer had conducted investigations into the root cause of reduced integrity in the commercial vaccine batches, and "changes were made in their processes to ensure that the integrity was improved and brought in line with what was seen for clinical trial batches." Health Canada said the three agencies subsequently determined that "there was no concern with the RNA integrity or any other product specifications." [Whew! Now I'm relieved! No data on the new levels produced. If you can't trust Pfizer, who can you trust?]

In general, the BMJ wasn't happy about anything they heard from the regulators. They were basically stonewalled in their requests.

The fact that **it's illegal for anyone to analyze the vials (they are government property)** doesn't help inspire confidence at all.

Even if you are getting 100% intact mRNA which would be really rare, you're still not getting anything that resembles the virus. So the **efficacy as far as PROTECTING you will be next to nothing**. However, what it will do very effectively, if you got **reasonably intact mRNA, is to cause you significant harm**. You are playing a game of chance with your immune system and what is in the bottle.

The [video highlights](#) some of the things we learned from the EMA data breach:

1. **The EMA claims the documents were manipulated** to make them look bad, but won't say how they were manipulated. I'm not buying the EMA story at all.
2. **The Members of the European Parliament (MEP) were not allowed to read the contracts** with the vaccine makers (only heavily redacted versions). Again, if you can't trust Pfizer and the EMA, who can you trust?
3. **The mRNA is unstable**, even at the required temperatures because light, movement (like shipping it to a destination), and any temperature variation disrupts it.
4. **Unstable mRNA means the spike protein (which was artificially propped up) could collapse** making the whole process useless to support immunity, but still dangerous in terms of damage to cells. So you get all the risk and no benefit.
5. **The mRNA integrity was better in the clinical trial than commercial batches**. But don't assume that the vaccine worked in the trials since the trials were heavily gamed to produce favorable outcomes, mostly by excluding people with weak immune systems from the vaccine group (this is why [there were 5X the number of exclusions in the vax group](#)). So you're looking at a vaccine which likely does absolutely nothing except make people believe they are protected. This mind control works quite well. People bought the story for over a year before they realized they were getting infected at the same rate as people who didn't get the vaccine.
6. **The mRNA integrity varied between countries**.
7. **Pfizer never told anyone that the commercial vaccines had lower mRNA integrity than the vaccines used in the trials**. This is unethical, bordering on fraud.
8. **The EMA tried to cover it up**. Instead of protecting the public and making Pfizer look bad, the EMA basically covered up the problem.
9. **Pfizer never told the public or governments about the risks associated with mRNA integrity**. If it wasn't for the leak, we'd never have known. But it's all OK because the drug companies are exempt from any liability. The patient takes all the risk here, not the drug companies.
10. **EMA was concerned about visible particles in the vials**. The BMJ never investigated that. Is it still a problem? I don't think anyone cares to know the answer to that.
11. **The deaths in the trials are all dismissed as "unrelated to the vaccine"** without doing the proper analysis.
12. **There should be an investigation into these issues**, but the **governments are not going to expose their own fraud** since it would be too embarrassing so nothing will happen.

This video summarizing the leaked EMA documents constitutes yet more **evidence that the vaccines confer no benefits, only risk**. However, like everything else, it **will be ignored by the authorities**.

However, this is important information for the public to know about how they are being manipulated into taking a useless vaccine. NOBODY is calling for any quality control here. Have you ever seen a study where the authors collect vials randomly and sequence them? It's not going to happen. Not in my lifetime.